

REMARKS

The Office Action alleged that the December 22, 2005 Amendment was non-responsive since it did not include a discussion pointing out the specific distinctions of newly-added Claim 26 over the prior art. Applicant traverses this assertion since, as clearly seen at page 12, Claim 26 is included within the discussion of patentability of Claims 1, 11, 21, 23 and 24. Nonetheless, Applicant provides the following patentability arguments for new claim 26.

Claim 26 includes features along the lines of Claims 1, 11, 21, 23 and 24. Specifically, Claim 26 is directed to a data transmission system, comprising a pursuing apparatus that pursues a location of a terminal which a user carries, a first information accumulating apparatus that transmits data to another information accumulating apparatus that corresponds to location information indicative of the location of the terminal pursued by said pursuing apparatus without an instruction from the user for transmission of the data, and a second information accumulating apparatus that receives data from said first information accumulating apparatus and stores the received data if said second information accumulating apparatus corresponds to the location information indicative of the location of the terminal pursued by said pursuing apparatus.

The art of record is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claim 26, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of a pursuing apparatus that pursues a location of a terminal which a user carries, and a second information accumulating apparatus that receives data from a first information accumulating apparatus and stores the received data if the second information accumulating apparatus corresponds to location information indicative of the location of the terminal pursued by said pursuing apparatus.

Kondou, Nagendran, and Snowdon were discussed in detail in the December 22, 2005 Amendment and none of those references, either alone or in any permissible combination, are seen to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of Claim 26.

The other claims in the application are believed to be allowable for the reasons set forth in the December 22, 2005 Amendment and therefore, the discussion included in that Amendment will not be repeated herein.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 112181v1